

1           IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
2           FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF OKLAHOMA

3           THE CITY OF TULSA, THE   )  
4           TULSA METROPOLITAN       )  
5           UTILITY AUTHORITY,       )

6                   Plaintiffs,       ) No. 01 CV 0900B(X)

7                   vs.                ) VIDEOTAPED

8                                       ) DEPOSITION OF

9           TYSON FOODS, INC.,       )

10          COBB-VANTRESS, INC.,    )

11          PETERSON FARMS, INC.,    ) RONALD J. MULLIKIN

12          SIMMONS FOODS, INC.,     )

13          CARGILL, INC., GEORGE'S, )

14          INC., CITY OF DECATUR,    )

15          ARKANSAS,                 )

16                   Defendants.       )

17          -----)

18                   THE VIDEOTAPED DEPOSITION OF RONALD J.  
19          MULLIKIN, taken before Karen J. Eichmann,  
20          Certified Shorthand Reporter and Notary Public  
21          of the State of Iowa, commencing at 12:02 p.m.,  
22          on the 18th day of July, 2002, at 421 West  
23          Broadway, Suite 405, Council Bluffs, Iowa.

24                   EXHIBIT 5

25                  Reported by: Karen J. Eichmann, C.S.R.

EXHIBIT

74

1 Q. Mr. Mullikin, would there -- would  
2 there be any reason to put any more phosphorus  
3 on a field than whatever the plant was -- that  
4 was being grown in the field could use in its  
5 uptake?

6 A. From an agronomic standpoint, there  
7 wouldn't. From a growing standpoint, there  
8 wouldn't.

9 Q. And from an environmental standpoint if  
10 one was in a watershed that was already  
11 sensitive to phosphorus because of years of  
12 phosphorus application and so forth, would there  
13 be any reason to put any more than the plant  
14 could uptake?

15 MS. BARTLEY: Object to form.

16 A. The -- the answer to that is there  
17 certainly wouldn't be, but the problem goes  
18 beyond that. For the grower himself that litter  
19 has always been a source of fertilizer, and most  
20 of the time it goes on pasture. And phosphate  
21 is not one of the elements that pasture ground  
22 needs in great numbers to thrive on. It needs  
23 nitrogen. And so it was a great source for the  
24 growers to be able to put nitrogen on their  
25 fields that it needed.

1 Q. And a side result of that was then too  
2 much phosphorus then got put on the fields?

3 MS. BARTLEY: Object to form.

4 A. That -- that's the end result.

5 Q. Is there any reason the company  
6 couldn't do something to correct that problem?

7 MS. BARTLEY: Object to form.

8 A. It is all about economics. The grower  
9 has their own fertilizer source being the  
10 litter; and because that is a source that is  
11 theirs, it doesn't cost them anything. To  
12 replace it with commercial fertilizer, it is a  
13 matter of economics.

14 Q. The commercial fertilizer could be  
15 mixed in such a way that it got the right  
16 amounts of the three elements that you  
17 mentioned; correct?

18 A. You could put straight nitrogen on it  
19 if you wanted to.

20 Q. Or any mixture, any combination of the  
21 three --

22 A. That's correct.

23 Q. -- for agronomic purposes?

24 A. That's correct.

25 Q. Is there any reason the poultry

1 that true?

2 MS. BARTLEY: Object to form.

3 A. And as you see there, I wasn't specific  
4 about a watershed. I was -- that is a general  
5 statement that I could make in the state of Iowa  
6 if that base-phosphate level were legislated to  
7 a certain point.

8 Q. Now you said earlier that the -- what  
9 was commonly grown in the watershed that we're  
10 concerned with here today, northwest Arkansas  
11 and Oklahoma, was pasture lands rather than row  
12 crops and things?

13 A. That's correct.

14 Q. And the agronomic needs of phosphorus  
15 for pastureland is approximately what?

16 A. It is going to depend on the soil type,  
17 but I can tell you substantially less.

18 Q. A range?

19 A. I would say that it would require --  
20 and I don't know as I would say.

21 Q. It's certainly under 300?

22 A. Oh, absolutely, absolutely.

23 Q. And could be down in the 50 to 70  
24 range?

25 A. Uh-huh, what it needed to sustain

1 growth.

2 Q. And then under opportunities it looks  
3 like essentially, again, you are talking about  
4 all these different techniques of alternate  
5 source utilization of the litter, are you not?

6 A. Uh-huh.

7 Q. Cattle feed, bedding purpose,  
8 pelletizing, fuel supply and so forth and so on?

9 A. Right.

10 Q. So you were beating that drum pretty  
11 hard it looks like?

12 MS. BARTLEY: Object to form.

13 A. I believe then and still believe that  
14 alternate use is still the best solution.

15 (Exhibit Number 17 was marked  
16 for identification by the reporter.)

17 Q. Let me now show you Exhibit 17. Would  
18 this be something that you would have also  
19 prepared and kept in your computer possibly?

20 A. Uh-huh, possibly.

21 Q. Is this your writing at the bottom of  
22 that first page?

23 A. Yes.

24 Q. Can you tell me what that refers to?  
25 Somebody's name and phone number obviously.

1 the ground and existing phosphate levels. I  
2 don't know as he was trying to replace them.  
3 Maybe he was, but that certainly wasn't my  
4 understanding.

5 Q. I guess in learning about these issues  
6 you developed some understanding of the  
7 historical practices of the companies and the  
8 growers and things like that, did you not?

9 A. To some extent.

10 Q. Even before you were there. So to your  
11 knowledge how long have growers in this area of  
12 northeast Oklahoma, northwest Arkansas been land  
13 applying chicken litter?

14 A. I can only speculate for as long as  
15 they've been growing chickens.

16 Q. So it could be for decades?

17 A. Absolutely.

18 Q. And this business of growing chickens  
19 in houses, when did that start to become  
20 prevalent?

21 A. I couldn't tell you.

22 Q. Again, a long time ago?

23 A. I would assume so.

24 Q. When did the -- if you gained any  
25 knowledge of this, when did any of the

1 integrator industry start gaining awareness of  
2 the -- of there being a problem with excess  
3 phosphorus in watersheds?

4 MS. BARTLEY: Object to the form.

5 A. It would seem to me that it became  
6 something on their radar screen, so to speak, at  
7 about the time I went to work for Peterson  
8 Farms.

9 Q. That is what you observed with respect  
10 to Peterson anyway?

11 A. Yes.

12 Q. Did you do any research to see if in  
13 other parts of the country they had had reason  
14 to have knowledge or concerns before that?

15 A. I talked to people on the Delmarva  
16 Peninsula, talked to them; and they had a little  
17 different set of circumstances because they are  
18 extremely concentrated, have very different soil  
19 types than what we have here. But I visited  
20 with them, visited with some individuals in  
21 eastern Texas as it related to some problems  
22 that they were having in different watersheds  
23 down there. And there were some folks in I  
24 believe it was Alabama that I talked to about  
25 how long they had been doing the various things



1 they had been doing.

2 And most of them had not been  
3 doing land application as long as they had in  
4 northwest Arkansas and northeast Oklahoma.

5 Q. And when did you learn that the  
6 problems manifested themselves let's start with  
7 Delmarva, approximately when?

8 A. I think their problems started to  
9 really be recognizable two or three years  
10 before we recognized a problem in northwest  
11 Arkansas.

12 Q. So you are saying mid-'90s or even  
13 before then?

14 A. I think mid-'90s.

15 Q. Mid-'90s?

16 A. Yeah.

17 Q. What about with respect to the Texas  
18 issue?

19 A. I think Texas didn't come about until  
20 maybe a little bit after or about the same time  
21 that we did.

22 Q. How about Alabama?

23 A. I think Alabama it manifested itself  
24 because they heard everyone else was having a  
25 problem with it.